UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,671	06/04/2007	06/04/2007 Omer Einav		4746
	7590 06/15/201 <b>OYNIHAN d/b/a PR</b> T	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1644	6	THANH, QUANG D		
ARLINGTON, VA 22215			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3771		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/15/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Company		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/597,67	1	EINAV ET AL.			
O.	ffice Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
		QUANG D		3771			
The Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this communication ly	n appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
2a) ☐ This a	onsive to communication(s) filed on action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)  this application is in condition for all d in accordance with the practice und	This action is no owance except	for formal matters, pro		e merits is		
Disposition of	Claims						
4a) O 5) ☐ Claim 6) ☐ Claim 7) ☐ Claim	is/are pending in the application in the application is and its in the application is and its in the application is are with the application is are allowed.  is a subjected in the application is are application in the application is a subject in the appl	hdrawn from cor					
Application Pa	pers						
10)∏ The d Applic Repla	Decification is objected to by the Exacrawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ant may not request that any objection to cement drawing sheet(s) including the coath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) the drawing(s) borrection is require	e held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 Cl	` ,		
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)							
2) 🔲 Notice of Dra	ferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946 Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Mail Date	8)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-11 and 37, drawn to a rehabilitation device with a frame and a joint.

Group II, claim(s) 12-36, drawn to a rehabilitation device with a rigid radial extension

and a controller.

Group III, claim(s) 38-44, drawn to a method of rehabilitation with resistance including compliance.

Group IV, claim(s) 45-51, 54-57 and 70-73, drawn to a rehabilitation device with a motor, a lever.

Group V, claim(s) 52-53, drawn to a multi-axis resilient element.

Group VI, claim(s) 58, drawn to a telescoping mechanism.

Group VII, claim(s) 59-65, drawn to a rehabilitation device with a base and two configurations.

Group VIII, claim(s) 66-69, drawn to a rehabilitation device with a separable element.

Group IX, claim(s) 74-78, drawn to a rehabilitation docking station.

Art Unit: 3771

2. The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of group I, a frame and a joint, is not shared in groups II-IX. The special technical feature of group II, a rigid extension and a controller, is not shared by groups I and III-IX. The special technical feature of group III, resistance including compliance, is not shared by groups I-II and IV-IX. The special technical feature of group IV, a lever and a motor, is not shared by groups I-III and V-IX. The special technical feature of group V, a resilient element, is not shared by groups I-IV and VI-IX. The special technical feature of group VI, telescoping mechanism, is not shared by groups I-V and VII-IX. The special technical feature of group VIII, a base and two configurations, is not shared by groups I-VI and VIII-IX. The special technical feature of group VIII, a separable element, is not shared by groups I-VIII and IX. The special technical feature of group IX, a docking port, is not shared by groups I-VIII. Therefore, the respective groups lack the same or corresponding special technical features and do not relate to a single general inventive concept.

Lack of unity of invention may be directly evident "a priori," that is, before considering the claims in relation to any prior art, or may only become apparent "a posteriori," that is, after taking the prior art into consideration. For example, independent claims to A +X, A + Y, X + Y can be said to lack unity a priori as there is no subject matter common to

all claims. In the case of independent claims to A + X and A + Y, unity of invention is present a priori as A is common to both claims. However, if it can be established that A is known, there is lack of unity a posteriori, since A (be it a single feature or a group of features) is not a technical feature that defines a contribution over the prior art.

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof.

Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case.

Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of

Application/Control Number: 10/597,671 Page 5

Art Unit: 3771

the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to QUANG D. THANH whose telephone number is (571)272-4982. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/597,671 Page 6

Art Unit: 3771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/QUANG D THANH/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3771